

REMARKS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Office Action dated 19 April 2005. Responsive to the Office Action, Claims 12-13 and 17-18 have been amended to independent form for further prosecution with the other pending Claims.

In the Office Action, the Examiner merely objected to Claims 12, 13, 17, and 18 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The Examiner indicated that these Claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base and any intervening claims. Accordingly, each of these Claims has now been amended to independent form, incorporating the subject matter of their base and any intervening claims. It is believed, therefore, that these Claims are now in allowable form.

Also in the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 9-11 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the Kadambi, et al. reference. In this regard, the Examiner stated that Kadambi, et al. discloses “a metal grounding member (12)” as well as “at least one peripherally projecting F antenna portion integrally formed with said metal grounding member,” which projects “in substantially coplanar manner from a periphery of said substantially planar portion of said metal grounding member,” (page 2 of the Office Action). The Examiner

relied for this upon Figs. 1A-1C and 14C, as well as the passage at column 7, lines 50-67 of the Kadambi, et al. reference.

Having carefully reviewed the Kadambi, et al. reference, and having scrutinized the Figures and passage of the Specification specifically noted by the Examiner, it is respectfully submitted that the correlations set forth by the Examiner cannot be reconciled with Kadambi, et al.'s actual teachings. Kadambi, et al. clearly shows in Figs. 1A-1C a "grounding plane 12" which is formed as an altogether separate component from the "radiating element 11a." What is more, the reference plainly explains that the "grounding plane [is] located below the radiating elements," (Abstract). Thus, the radiating element 11a is neither "integrally formed with," nor projects "in substantially coplanar manner from a periphery of" this grounding plane 12. Not even remotely so.

Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection on this basis appears to reflect a misreading or misinterpretation of the Kadambi, et al. reference. It is respectfully requested therefore, that the Examiner withdraw the rejection based upon this Kadambi, et al. reference, or in the alternative, provide a clearer explanation of the rejection's basis so that the Applicant may adequately address.

MR2561-133

Serial Number: 10/667,433

Reply to Office Action dated 19 April 2005

It is believed that the subject Patent Application is now fully in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE



Jun Y. Lee
Registration #40,262

Dated: 7/19/05

Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678